

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending. Claims 1 and 5 are the only independent claims. Claims 1, 3 and 5 have been amended to address minor informalities without in any way narrowing their scope. The amendments were not made in response to a rejection of the claims based on any statutory requirements but are simply to improve the idiomatic English.

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent 6,493,379 (Tanaka) in view of U.S. Patent 6,959,169 (Miyoshi). Claims 4 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Tanaka in view of Miyoshi and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,064,338 (Kobayakawa et al.). Applicant traverses and submits that the independent claims are patentable over the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a second step of performing a constraint process for the antenna weight obtained in the first step to maintain the beam gain constant in the arrival direction of the desired signal. This feature, *inter alia*, allows the antenna weight for adaptive control to be stabilized.

Tanaka shows that an antenna weight is used to form beams. In the Office Action, the position was taken that the cross correlation function of Tanaka corresponds to the recited constraint process. However, Tanaka states that the cross correlation process is used to estimate an arrival direction of a desired signal. See, e.g., col. 10, lines 19-20.

No teaching has been found in Tanaka that the cross correlation constant is a direction constraint to maintain the beam constant in the arrival direction, as in the independent claims. Miyoshi, which shows that an antenna weight is generated, does

not teach the recited constraint process of claim 1 and for at least this reason does not remedy this deficiency of Tanaka as a reference against claim 1. Thus, the Office Action has not set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness since the cited references, even when combined, do not teach or suggest all the elements of claim 1.

Independent claim 5 recites a substantially similar feature and is believed patentable for substantially the same reasons.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Dated: April 20, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Joseph W. Ragusa
Joseph W. Ragusa

Registration No.: 38,586
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
41st Floor
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant